REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed August 29, 2007, the Examiner indicated that claims 1-10 are pending; rejected claims 2 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph; rejected claims 2 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph; and rejected claims 1-10 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Sackstein et al. (WO 98/45959). New claims 11-13 are added herein. Thus, claims 1-13 are currently pending. The rejections are traversed below.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 2 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first and second paragraph.

Claims 2 and 7 are amended herein to more fully comply with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112. Applicants respectfully direct the Examiner to the Specification page 10, lines 23-30 (description of Figure 5) and page 15, lines 8-14 (description of S1 in Figure 6) for background regarding the picture types of each set of frames.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Sackstein et al. (WO 98/45959).

Claim 1 recites "a second unit discarding a second set of frames, which lie between two frames of the first set of frames in the input video sequence, to cause the encoding unit to skip each frame in the second set of frames and perform predictive coding of a corresponding frame of the first set of frames immediately preceding a frame from the second set of frames" (lines 6-9). The Applicant respectfully submits that Sackstein et al. fails to disclose this feature.

Sackstein et al. discusses that "A P frame is inserted in the stream in place of each discarded frame" (page 3, lines 17 and 18). Regarding the above features of claim 1, page 3 of the Office Action states that:

> Examiner assert that corresponds exactly to what is described in Sackstien discloses where a dummy frame is inserted by encoding the immediately preceding frame that was not skipped as described in the cited sections. Examiner interpreters this to be exactly what is being described in the claim language.

However, the Applicant respectfully submits that the embodiment described in claim 1 operates in a different manner.

As recited in claim 1, a second set of frames lying between two of the first set of frames are discarded. One objective of this discarding is to reduce the number of frames originally contained in the input video sequence prior to compression (see the last two lines of claim 1, see also page 5, lines 17-23, of the application). On the other hand, per the above, Sackstein et al. discusses that where a picture frame is discarded, a P frame is **inserted** in its place. "These P frames specify that all of the information for the frame exists in the previous reference frame in the stream and are therefore relatively small" (page 3, lines 18-20, of Sackstein et al.). No such insertion is recited in claim 1. Were one to use the encoding scheme discussed in Sackstein et al. to discard picture frames without inserting P frames, the scheme would almost certainly be non-functional. Thus, Sackstein et al. fails to anticipate claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

Claims 2-5 depend from claim 1 and add additional features thereto. Thus, the arguments above with respect to claim 1 also apply to these claims.

Claim 6 recites "discarding a second set of frames, which lie between two frames of the first set of frames in the input video sequence, to cause the encoding unit to skip each frame in the second set of frames and perform predictive coding of a corresponding frame of the first set of frames immediately preceding a frame from the second set of frames" (lines 5-8). Thus, the arguments above with respect to claim 1 also apply to claim 6 and claim 6 patentably distinguishes over Sackstein et al.

Claims 7-10 depend from claim 6 and add additional features thereto. Thus, the arguments above with respect to claim 1 also apply to these claims.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome.

New Claims

New claims 11-13 are added herein. Support for the new claims is found, for example, on page 11, line 31 through page 12, line 14 and page 15, line 8 through page 16, line 9, of the application.

Claim 11 recites that "header information of each of a plurality of video packs in the input video sequence is read to determine whether the currently read video pack is a head-end video pack of the input video sequence." Nothing is cited or found in Sackstein et al. that discloses this feature.

Claim 12 recites that "a head-end count number is incremented by 1 each time it is determined that a video pack is a head-end video pack, and a frame is left in the input video

7

sequence if a remainder from dividing the head-end count number by the predetermined interval is 0, and if the remainder is not 0, the frame is discarded." Nothing is cited or found in <u>Sackstein et al.</u> that discloses this feature.

Claim 13 recites:

> retaining a first frame for each of a plurality of pictures in an input video sequence, each picture having a plurality of frames;
> discarding frames after the first frame for each respective picture in the input video sequence; and
> prediction coding each picture after a first picture in the input video sequence using the first frame of a respective preceding picture, thereby reducing a number of frames to be decoded.

Nothing is cited or found in <u>Sackstein et al.</u> that discloses these features.

In view of the above it is respectfully submitted that new claims 11-13 patentably distinguish over the cited art.

Summary

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 12-27-2007

By: Michael A. Leonard II
Registration No. 60,180

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501